```
1
                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                   EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
       UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                       11-CR-31(KAM)
 4
                                        U.S. Courthouse
 5
                                        Brooklyn, New York
             -against-
 6
                                        TRANSCRIPT OF
                                        SENTENCING
 7
8
       NEIL MESSINA,
                                        November 8, 2013
                                        12:45 p.m.
9
              Defendant.
10
11
    BEFORE:
                    HONORABLE KIYO A. MATSUMOTO, U.S.D.J.
12
    APPEARANCES:
13
    For the Government:
                              LORETTA E. LYNCH, ESQ.
                              United States Attorney
14
                              271 Cadman Plaza East
15
                              Brooklyn, New York 11201
                              BY: ALLON LIFSHITZ, ESQ.
16
                                   AMANDA HECTOR, ESQ.
                                   Assistant U.S. Attorneys
17
18
    For the Defendant:
                             GERALD J. McMAHON, ESQ.
                              MATTHEW MARI, ESQ.
19
20
21
                         Holly Driscoll, CSR
    Court Reporter:
22
                         Official Court Reporter
                         225 Cadman Plaza East
                         Brooklyn, New York 11201
23
                         (718) 613-2274
24
    Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
    produced by Computer-Assisted Transcript.
25
```

	2
1	THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody.
2	MS. McMAHON: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Please have a seat.
4	THE CLERK: This is criminal cause for a sentencing,
5	11-CR-31, USA versus Neil Messina. Will the government state
6	their appearances please.
7	MR. LIFSHITZ: Allon Lifshitz and Amanda Hector for
8	the United States. Good afternoon, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
10	THE CLERK: And for Mr. Messina.
11	MS. McMAHON: Gerald J. McMahon and Matthew Mari for
12	the defendant. Good afternoon, Your Honor.
13	MR. MARI: Good afternoon, Judge.
14	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
15	Good afternoon, Mr. Messina. How are you?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Let me ask you please do you speak and
18	understand English without difficulty?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20	THE COURT: Please raise your right hand and take an
21	oath.
22	(Defendant sworn by the clerk.)
23	THE DEFENDANT: I do.
24	THE CLERK: Thank you.
25	THE COURT: Mr. Messina, good afternoon. I'd like
	- -

3 1 to just point out that we have a court reporter here who is 2 making a transcript of today's proceeding, it will be part of 3 the official court record if you choose to exercise your 4 appellate rights. I'd like to confirm that the government has given 5 all the victims timely notice of today's proceedings; is that 6 7 correct? 8 MR. LIFSHITZ: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor, and 9 we would note that two members of the family of Joseph Pistone 10 are here, a brother and a sister, and they wish to be heard at 11 the appropriate time. 12 THE COURT: All right. I'll certainly give them 13 that opportunity. 14 I'd also note though I haven't received any loss affidavits in connection with the restitution which is 15 16 mandatory in this case. 17 MR. LIFSHITZ: Yes, Your Honor. So, in light of 18 that, we would not seek restitution. 19 THE COURT: Are they seeking restitution? 20 MR. LIFSHITZ: Not as far as I understand it. I 21 think everyone has been given a chance to submit affidavits. 22 THE COURT: So, they've been given the affidavits 23 but haven't turned them in; is that correct? 24 MR. LIFSHITZ: That is my understanding, yes. 25 THE COURT: In preparation for today's sentencing

I've reviewed the plea minutes dated February 14th, 2013 1 2 of Mr. Messina's plea. I've also reviewed the PSR dated 3 August 2nd, 2013 prepared by the Probation Department as 4 well as the addendum dated November 4th, 2013. I've also reviewed the government's letters dated October 16, 2013 5 and November 7, 2013; and, finally, I've reviewed defense 6 7 counsel's sentencing memorandum dated October 9th, 2013, and every single one of the dozens of letters that were submitted 8 9 on behalf of Mr. Messina under cover of his October 9th, 2013 10 letter. I've also reviewed defense counsel's letters dated 11 August 14th and August 21st with objections to the PSR, and a 12 letter dated October 31st, 2013 which attached additional 13 letters on behalf Mr. Messina. I believe it was the letter 14 from Mr. Messina and his companion. 15 Have I overlooked any submissions? 16 MS. McMAHON: No, Your Honor. 17 MR. LIFSHITZ: No, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: I'd also like to confirm that 19 Mr. Messina is a United States citizen so we need not 20 address consul notification; is that correct? 21 MS. McMAHON: Yes, Judge. THE COURT: Thank you. 22 23 Mr. Messina, are you satisfied with your attorneys, 24 Mr. McMahon and Mr. Mari? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: And are there any unresolved conflicts 1 2 or contentions or dissatisfactions between counsel and the 3 client? 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Messina does appear to be fully 5 alert and to be following these proceedings closely. 6 7 Would you agree with that observation, Mr. McMahon? 8 MS. McMAHON: Absolutely, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason why we should 10 not proceed with Mr. Messina's sentencing today? 11 MS. McMAHON: No. Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Messina, have you had the 13 opportunity to read the sentencing submissions including the 14 PSR and the submissions by your attorney and the government regarding your sentencing? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Did you have any difficulty 18 understanding those submissions? 19 THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Are you ready now to be sentenced? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. And I trust you've had the 23 opportunity to review all of the sentencing submissions with 24 your lawyer and to ask any questions that you might have? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Messina, you did plead guilty before Judge Reyes on February 14th, 2013. Do you wish to contest that plea?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may recall, sir, that at the plea you were placed under oath, Judge Reyes then advised you of the nature of the charges and asked you questions to ascertain your understanding of the charges, your rights and the consequences of your guilty plea to those charges.

In addition, he asked you questions about what you did in connection with the offense and the racketeering acts to which you pled guilty. Were your answers to Judge Reyes's questions truthful and accurate, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have reviewed Mr. Messina's plea transcript before Judge Reyes on February 14th of this year and I do find that Mr. Messina's guilty plea on that date was knowing and voluntary and based upon a full understanding of his rights and the consequences of his plea and that there is a factual basis for his plea of guilty. I therefore do accept Mr. Messina's plea of guilty to Count One of the 15-count superseding indictment, that is a racketeering conspiracy which charged that between February 1989 and January 2011, the defendant, together with others, being a person employed by and associated with the Bonanno organized crime family of

La Cosa Nostra, an enterprise that engaged in, and the activities of which affected, interstate and foreign commerce, knowingly and intentionally conspired to violate Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1962(c), that is, to conduct and participate either directly or indirectly in the affairs of that enterprise through a pattern of racketeering, as defined by Title 18, U.S. Code, Sections 1961(1) and 1961(5). The defendant agreed that a conspirator would commit at least two acts of racketeering activity in the conduct of the affairs of the Bonanno crime enterprise.

I also accepted Mr. Messina's plea to Racketeering Act 2A of the superseding indictment in which he states that he knowingly and intentionally conspired to forcibly steal a property, specifically money, from Joseph Pistone, while armed with a deadly weapon, in violation of New York Penal Law Sections 160.15(2) and 105.10.

I further accepted Mr. Messina's plea to
Racketeering Act 3 of the superseding indictment which
charged illegal gambling, sports betting, which charged
that he knowingly and intentionally used wire communications
in interstate commerce to assist in placing bets and wagers
on sporting events and contests in violation of Title 18,
U.S. Code, Section 1084(a) and 2, and that he knowingly and
intentionally used one or more facilities in interstate
commerce in connection with an illegal gambling business, in

violation of New York Penal Law Section 225.05, and also carried on such unlawful activity in violation of Title 18, U.S. Code, Sections 1952(a)(2)(A) and 2.

I further accepted Mr. Messina's plea to Racketeering Act 5 of the superseding indictment, extortionate extension of credit, which charged that the defendant, together with others, knowingly and intentionally made one or more extortionate extensions of credit to John Doe Number One, in violation of Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 892(a) and 2.

Now, the parties have entered into a plea agreement pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 11(c)(1)(B) under which the government has agreed to recommend a sentence of 120 months. Pursuant to Guideline 6B1.2(b), which covers Rule 11(c)(1)(B) pleas, the court may accept the recommendation of the government if it is satisfied either that, first, the recommended sentence is within the applicable guideline range, or, second, that the recommended sentence is outside the applicable guideline range for justifiable reasons and those reasons are set forth with specificity in the statement of reasons form.

As I will describe in detail, although the PSR and the court have calculated the guideline range to be between 360 months to life, the court has calculated that Mr. Messina's effective guideline range is 240 months and, thus, the recommended sentence in the plea agreement falls

very significantly below the effective guideline range, 50 percent below in fact. But the government has failed, in the court's view, to articulate any justifiable reason why a downward departure of 120 months, or 50 percent, is justified and the court has not been able to discern any such reason from the submissions by the parties. To the contrary, the government has described in detail in its sentencing memorandum the very significant role played by Mr. Messina in many serious crimes, often with members or associates of organized crime, or under the auspices of organized crime, which crimes would in fact seem to call for a sentence significantly above the government's recommended sentence of 120 months.

In its November 7th letter, the government asserts that a sentence of 120 months imprisonment will "adequately reflect the seriousness of the actual offense behavior" and will not "undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing or the Sentencing Guidelines." The government further states that the "recommended sentence appropriately balances the defendant's criminal history and the seriousness of the defendant's conduct against the significant prosecutorial risks and burdens avoided through a negotiated resolution" because the plea agreement in this case gives the court "the opportunity to impose a reasonable sentence in light of the defendant's acceptance of responsibility, and of permitting

the government to focus its resources on additional offenders and additional threats."

In other words, it appears to the court that the government's recommendation of a sentence that would constitute a dramatic downward departure seems to be based exclusively on the fact that Mr. Messina agreed to plead guilty, which is underscored by the lone citation in its November 7th letter to section 9-27.420 of the United States Attorney's Manual, which only lists various criteria for federal prosecutors to continue in deciding whether to enter into plea agreements.

The commentary to Guideline 6B1.2 contradicts the government's contention that the fact that Mr. Messina entered into a plea agreement is sufficient justification for a downward departure. The commentary to Guideline 6B1.2 states that "the court may not depart below the applicable guideline range merely because of the defendant's decision to plead guilty to the offense or to enter a plea agreement with respect to the offense."

The commentary further provides that "a defendant who enters a plea of guilty in a timely manner will enhance the likelihood of his receiving a reduction in offense level under Guideline 3E1.1 for acceptance of responsibility.

Further reduction in offense level or sentence due to a plea agreement will tend to undermine the sentencing guidelines."

Moreover, the court is concerned that a departure of the recommended magnitude would be contrary to Title 18, U.S. Code, Section 3553(a)(6), which states that the court shall take into account the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. I note that the government's inability to articulate justifiable reasons for such a large downward departure in this case is troubling in light of the fact that the government has sought sentences within the guidelines range for nearly all of the several dozen defendants who pled guilty in related prosecutions and allocuted to acts that were, for the most part, far less serious than the armed robbery conspiracy, extortionate extension of credit, and illegal gambling charge that Mr. Messina has allocuted to.

Accordingly, the court finds no justifiable reason for accepting the government's recommended sentence of 120 months and I respectfully must reject that recommendation.

Now, Mr. Messina does have the right to schedule a Fatico fact-finding hearing at which the parties may offer evidence relevant to sentencing. Would he like to exercise that right?

MS. McMAHON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Would you like to do that then -- I'd like to schedule it, if we could, next week if

that's possible, or I don't know what's necessary in terms of the government's evidence. We can look ahead a little bit but I do have an increasingly more conflicted calendar as the month progresses.

MR. LIFSHITZ: Your Honor, next week is not possible because I'm on trial beginning on Tuesday before Judge Cogan.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LIFSHITZ: That will last about a month. In addition, proving some of these crimes will require marshaling witnesses and other evidence from other parts of the country, particularly the 1989 Maniscalco murder -- solicitation to murder.

So, can I talk with my colleague for a moment?

THE COURT: Yes, you may, and maybe consult with

Mr. McMahon about a date.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

MR. LIFSHITZ: Your Honor, the parties would suggest that we file a joint letter by the end of next week suggesting a schedule because it would be a rather protracted Fatico hearing. It wouldn't be like the typical Fatico hearing in that we're trying to prove a number of crimes that weren't pled guilty to, it would be more like a trial.

THE COURT: All right. If you would kindly give me several dates that are good for both parties, I'd appreciate it because I do have trials I think back to back in January,

13 so we could do it during December or thereafter. 1 2 MS. McMAHON: I have a retrial on a Staten Island 3 murder case which is starting either December 3 or December 4 10. THE COURT: And how long will that last, sir? 5 The last trial, the original trial 6 MS. McMAHON: 7 went for five weeks. 8 THE COURT: All right. Well, I will say that I 9 would appreciate clarification as to which issues you want the 10 Fatico hearing on. If it's every disputed issue, I'd like to know that. You did object to certain statements in the PSR 11 12 which were based on the probation officer's consultation with 13 the government. 14 MS. McMAHON: Right. 15 THE COURT: It is my understanding that the government believes it can prove the facts that are in dispute 16 by a preponderance of the evidence. I don't know which of 17 18 those facts beyond those that you identified in your 19 submission you are objecting to or seeking a hearing on. 20 MS. McMAHON: If there are any other others, Judge, 21 I would promptly give them notice by Monday or Tuesday. 22 THE COURT: All right. I'd appreciate some notice 23 too if I could. 24 MS. McMAHON: When I said the government, I meant

25

filing ECF.

```
14
 1
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Then we will
 2
    have to schedule this.
 3
               I apologize to the Pistone family, I'm sure this is
 4
    not a delay they appreciate but I will schedule the hearing
 5
    accordingly.
 6
               MS. McMAHON:
                             Okay.
 7
                           Thank you all.
               THE COURT:
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
9
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, sir.
               (Time noted: 1:10 p.m.)
10
11
               (End of proceedings.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```